

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

JAMES BUTCHER JR.,

Appellant,

v.

LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD,

Respondent.

) Case No. ALLO-05-0002

)  
) FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF  
) LAW AND ORDER OF THE BOARD

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, BUSSE NUTLEY, Vice Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated January 7, 2005. The hearing was held at the Personnel Appeals Board, 2828 Capitol Boulevard, Olympia, Washington, on June 16, 2005.

**Appearances.** Appellant James Butcher Jr. was present and was represented by Lyle Loncosty and Luis Moscoso of the Washington Public Employees Association. Human Resources Manager Frances Perry represented Respondent Liquor Control Board (LCB).

**Background.** Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) to LCB Human Resources on January 28, 2004, requesting that his Plant Mechanic position #0983 be reallocated to a higher level position. In response to Appellant's request, Human Resources Manager Frances Perry and Human Resources Consultant Ron Key visited Appellant's work site to gain more information about his duties and responsibilities. In addition, Ms. Perry reviewed Appellant's updated CQ and a draft specification Appellant created to describe his duties. By letter dated March 30, 2004, Ms.

1 Perry notified Appellant that the Plant Mechanic classification was the appropriate allocation of his  
2 position based on the description of his duties. Ms. Perry also informed Appellant that the  
3 establishment of a new classification required approval from the Personnel Resources Board but  
4 that a moratorium existed on the establishment of new classes due to the implementation of Civil  
5 Service Reform and the new Personnel System.

6  
7 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant asserts the duties he performs are more complex  
8 and specialized than the duties described in the Plant Mechanic class specification. Appellant  
9 asserts his duties differ from those performed by other institutional plant mechanics because he is  
10 required to have specialized knowledge to maintain the robotics system and complex automated  
11 warehouse equipment unique to the LCB Distribution Center. Appellant argues that only a small  
12 percentage of the duties he performs is listed in the Plant Mechanic class specification and contends  
13 he has more responsibility than the class specification reflects.

14  
15 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent does not dispute that Appellant's duties are  
16 unique and differ from other plant mechanics working at other state facilities. However,  
17 Respondent contends the Human Resources Department was involved in an extensive site visit and  
18 review of Appellant's work and has determined Appellant's duties best fit within the Plant  
19 Mechanic class specification. Respondent further argues that the department does not have the  
20 authority to create a new class specification and asserts the Department of Personnel has put a  
21 moratorium on the creation of new classes. Therefore, Respondent argues Appellant's duties are  
22 best encompassed in the Plant Mechanic classification.

23  
24 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated  
25 to the Plant Mechanic classification should be affirmed.

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Plant Mechanic, class code 75550; Plant Manager 1, class code 75700.

2  
3 The definition for the class of Plant Mechanic states:

4       Performs skilled mechanical work on plant machinery and mechanical equipment  
5       and systems.

6 The definition for the class of Plant Manager 1 states:

7       Directs maintenance, repair, and alteration of buildings, equipment, and grounds  
8       at small institution or similar facility or serves as assistant to plant manager of  
9       large institution or similar facility.

10 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
11 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
12 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
13 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
14 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
15 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
16 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
17 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).  
18

19 Appellant performs skilled work in the operation, maintenance, and repairs of specialized plant  
20 machinery to ensure minimum downtime at the LCB Distribution Center. Appellant's duties  
21 include preventive maintenance on a very specific automated warehouse system. Although  
22 Appellant's specific duties may be more specialized than the broader definition of a Plant  
23 Mechanic, we must identify the classification that most closely addresses the scope, range of duties  
24 and skills Appellant performs. To determine the class which best describes the overall duties and  
25 responsibilities of Appellant's position, we have considered all relevant classifications, including  
26

1 Plant Mechanic and Plant Manager 1. We understand Appellant's duties are unique because of the  
2 sophisticated operation of the LCB Distribution Center. However, the Board is limited to reviewing  
3 the existing classifications. Appellant has not met his burden of proving that position #0983 should  
4 be reallocated to a higher level position based on the classifications available. Therefore, on a best  
5 fit basis, we conclude that Plant Mechanic is the correct classification.

6  
7 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied, and the Director's  
8 determination dated January 7, 2005, should be affirmed and adopted.

9  
10 **ORDER**

11 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by James Butcher  
12 Jr. is denied, and the Director's determination, dated January 7, 2005, is affirmed and adopted.

13  
14 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

15  
16 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

17  
18  
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 Busse Nutley, Vice Chair

21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 Gerald L. Morgen, Member